



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/785,627	C	02/24/2004	Dieter Heldmann	HELDMANN ET ALI	2960	
25889	7590	11/29/2005		EXAMINER		
WILLIAM		_	NOLAN, JASON MICHAEL			
COLLARD &	,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ROSLYN, N	IY 11576	5	1626			

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)					
			27	HELDMANN ET A	AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examine	,	Art Unit					
		Jason M.	Nolan, Ph.D.	1626					
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communicati Reply	ion appears on th	e cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	idress				
WHICH - Extensi after SI - If NO p - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR IEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL! ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica- eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, but yoly received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF THE CFR 1.136(a). In no extition.  y period will apply and we by statute, cause the apply	HIS COMMUNICATIO ent, however, may a reply be ti ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron lication to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this c ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,				
Status					·				
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 24 February 20	04.						
·	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
′=	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositio	n of Claims								
4)× 0	claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application	ation.							
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) <u>1 and 4-9</u> is/are rejected.								
	Claim(s) <u>2 and 3</u> is/are objected to.								
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicatio	n Papers								
	ne specification is objected to by the Ex	raminer							
•—	•		☐ objected to by the	Examiner.					
-	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the				FR 1.121(d).				
	ne oath or declaration is objected to by	•	= , ,	•	, ,				
•	der 35 U.S.C. § 119		-						
		oreian priority un	der 35 U.S.C. & 119/a	u)-(d) or (f)					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:									
	1. ☑ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
·	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* Se	e the attached detailed Office action for	•	• • •	ed.					
				•					
Attachment(s			0 □ L	· (DTO 440)	•				
	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9	948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D						
3) 🔯 Informa	tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO <sub>0</sub> No(s)/Mail Date 6/9/04 & 5/27/04.			Patent Application (PT	O-152)				

Art Unit: 1626

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-9 are currently pending in the application.

### Priority

Acknowledgement is made of Applicant's claim for priority via foreign patent application Germany 103 08 580.7, filed on February 27, 2003.

### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant's information disclosure statements (IDS), filed on June 9, 2004 and May 27, 2004 have been considered. Please refer to Applicant's copies of the 1449 submitted herewith.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Application/Control Number: 10/785,627

Art Unit: 1626

Claims 1 and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mulqueen et al. (*Tetrahedron* 1993, 49(24), 5359) and Krich et al. (*Austrian Patent Application A* 1639/2001 10/15/2001, for convenience see *US Patent* 6,894,170).

## Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP § 2141.01)

Mulqueen et al. teaches the methylation of thiazolidine I affording compound II using lithium diisopropylamide and methyl iodide at -90°C in a solution of THF/DMPU.

Krich et al. teaches a method for methylating thiazolines III using lithium diisopropylamide and methyl iodide preferably from –30°C to +35°C to arrive at alkylated compounds IV, (see specification, column 4, line 9 through line 40).

Noteworthy in this reference is the object of finding a process which can be carried out on an industrial scale which guarantees the preparation of substituted thiazolines in higher yields (see specification, column 1, line 66) as well as utilizing the same starting material as the instant application for the process (see specification, column 3, line 13).

Art Unit: 1626

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP § 2141.02)

The difference between the prior art of Mulqueen et al. and the process of the instant application is that the process of the instant application is run at warmer temperatures. The difference between the prior art of Krich et al. and the process of the instant application is of the structures of compounds I and III. Although slightly different in structure, the difference is not at the reactive site of these compounds. The identical reactive site in both species (I and III) contains the most acidic hydrogen (alpha to the ester carbonyl carbon), which is deprotonated using lithium diisopropylamide to generate the corresponding enolate, which when treated with electrophiles such as iodomethane yields the desired products II and IV respectively.

Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (MPEP § 2142-2413)

The optimization of variables, such as temperature, in a known process is *prima* facie obvious. *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (1980).

One skilled in the art would thus be motivated to utilize the processes as taught by Krich et al. and Mulqueen et al. but vary temperatures to arrive at the instant claimed process with the expectation of optimizing a known process. Absent factual unexpected, unobvious, and beneficial results, the claimed invention would have been suggested to one skilled in the art and therefore, the instant claimed invention would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

## Claim Objections

Claims 2 and 3 are objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Application/Control Number: 10/785,627

Art Unit: 1626

Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: claims must end with a period. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: claims must begin on a new line. Appropriate correction is required.

#### Conclusion

Claims 1 and 4-9 are rejected.

Claims 2 and 3 are objected to.

## Telephone Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jason M. Nolan, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4356**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (9:00 - 5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on (571) 272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 6

KAMAL A. SAEED, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER

Joseph K. McKane Supervisory Patent Examiner Art Unit 1626

Date: November 22, 2005

Jason M. Nolan, Ph.D. Examiner

Art Unit 1626